

REMARKS

In response to the objection to the disclosure based on certain formal issues cited by the Examiner in the first paragraph on page 2 of the Office Action, Applicants have amended the specification in a manner which addresses and is believed to resolve each of the cited formal issues. With regard to the reference designation "SK", Applicants note that that feature is referred to and described in the specification at page 7, lines 8 and 12, and page 8, line 3. To emphasize this point, the parenthetical expression "(Figures 2 and 3)" has been added after the reference to "structures SK" at page 7, line 12. The reference designation "TM", on the other hand, appears at page 8 of the substitute specification in the first and second complete paragraphs with respect to the discussion of Figures 4 and 5. With regard to the reference designation "RM" in Figure 5, Applicants have added a sentence at the end of the final paragraph on page 8, indicating that the metallized rear-face RM is also shown in Figure 5. Support for this characterization of the designation RM is found in the substitute specification at page 3, line 1. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of these grounds of objection are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph for allegedly failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the invention, based on certain formal issues identified in page 2 of the Office Action. In particular, the Office Action indicates that it is unclear how the "structured metallic layer" relates to the "at least one metallic stripline". In response to this

ground of rejection, Applicants note that the structured metallic layer TM and the metallic striplines (ML1, ML2) are clearly shown in Figures 4 and 5. In particular, it is apparent that the metallic stripline (ML1, ML2) is separate from the structured metallic layer (TM). In this regard, Claim 1 as amended recites that the substrate has an upper face that is coated on at least a portion thereof with a structured metallic layer, "and also has at least one metallic stripline thereon". Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that this language makes it clear that the structured metallic layer and the at least one metallic stripline are indeed separate elements, both of which reside on the upper face of the substrate. Similarly, Claim 6 recites that a substrate is at least partially coated with a structured metallic layer and furthermore that at least one metallic stripline is formed on the substrate. Applicants respectfully submit that this language, when considered in view of the specification is clear and definite.

In Claim 6, at line 5, the spelling of the word "filter" has been corrected.

Claims 1-14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Takahashi et al. However, for the reasons set forth hereinafter, Applicants respectfully submit that all claims which remain of record distinguish over the cited Takahashi et al reference.

Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations formerly contained in claims 3 and 5, which have been cancelled. With regard to amended Claim 1, Applicants note that Takahashi et al does not disclose a component which "has a web which rests on the structured metallic layer on the upper face" of a

substrate. Rather, as can be seen from Figure 6A and 6B, and as discussed at Column 5, lines 38-47, it is apparent that the Takahashi et al structure includes a plurality of Au microbumps 306 formed on the flat face around the cavity 303. Clearly, this arrangement does not constitute a circumferential "web". With such microbumps 306, an electrical connection is established between the ground layer 304 formed on the cavity and on the substrate 302.

In the web guide filter structure according to the invention, in which the web follows the structure of the component, it is insured that after using a joining method, the conductive solder and the conductive adhesive provide an optimal current linkage along the web. Moreover, with the web following the structure of the component, it is insured that there are no gaps between the substrate and component, which otherwise might cause interfering electric fields. The advantage of providing such a web is that a conductive solder or the conductive adhesive can be distributed in the space between the filter upper part and the substrate when they are joined together. This insurances an optimum connection. In addition, the web makes it possible to achieve exact positioning of the component on the structured layer.

By contrast, as can be seen from Figure 6B in Takahashi et al, gaps exist between the substrate and the component, after a joining method has been applied.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that all claims which remain of record in this application distinguish over Takahashi et al, and are allowable.

In light of the foregoing remarks, this application should be in condition for allowance, and early passage of this case to issue is respectfully requested. If there are any questions regarding this amendment or the application in general, a telephone call to the undersigned would be appreciated since this should expedite the prosecution of the application for all concerned.

If necessary to effect a timely response, this paper should be considered as a petition for an Extension of Time sufficient to effect a timely response, and please charge any deficiency in fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 05-1323 (Docket #056226.56029US).

Respectfully submitted,



Gary R. Edwards
Registration No. 31,824

CROWELL & MORING LLP
Intellectual Property Group
P.O. Box 14300
Washington, DC 20044-4300
Telephone No.: (202) 624-2500
Facsimile No.: (202) 628-8844
GRE:kms
3935050_1